

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 17-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-11, 13, 17-27, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,336,135 (“Niblett et al.”). Claims 12 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Niblett et al. in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0041147 (“Van Den Oord et al.”). Claims 14-16 and 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Niblett et al.

Claims 1 and 17-32 are currently amended. No new matter has been added. For example, the subject matter added to claims 1 and 17 is supported in the Specification at least at paragraph [0034] (“core components could include those that are to be performed by the RM server synchronously with regard to responding to the request”). Additional subject matter added to claim 17 is supported in the Specification at least at the Appendix (“s_AuthenticatedState” and “s_AuthenticatedId”). Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the claim amendments and remarks to follow is respectfully requested.

Telephone Conversation With Examiner

Examiner Krishnan is thanked for the telephone conversation conducted on August 4, 2010. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 was discussed. Clarifying amendments to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 were discussed. Proposed amendments and asserted art were discussed. It appears that the proposed amendments to claim 17 overcome the rejections based on the asserted art. Clarifying amendments to claim 1 were discussed.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

The following rejections are asserted under 35 U.S.C. § 101:

- (i) Claims 17-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The rejection is understood to be based on the premise that claims 17-32 are directed to a computer-readable medium, which allegedly can be construed to include transitory propagating signals. Claim 17 has been amended, without prejudice or disclaimer to recite “wherein the computer-readable storage medium is not a signal.” Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection of claims 17-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The applicants respectfully submit that it is clear from the specification of the instant application and its prosecution history that the term “computer-readable storage medium” does not encompass a signal *per se* and was not intended to do so. Consequently, the applicants do not believe that the addition of the phrase “wherein the computer-readable storage medium is not a signal” changes the scope of the original preamble in any way. Nevertheless, in the interests of advancing prosecution, the applicants have amended the preamble of claim 17 in the manner suggested by the Patent Office.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

The following anticipation rejections are asserted under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b):

(i) Claims 1-11, 13, 17-27, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,336,135 (“Niblett et al.”).

As to claims 1 and 17, the rejection is understood to be based on the premise that Niblett et al. discloses the claimed limitations, for example, at column 3, lines 15-23, column 4, lines 39-44, column 6, lines 43-63, column 7, lines 8-30, and column 8, lines 23-26. In particular, column 6, lines 43-63, is cited as disclosing core task components, while column 7, lines 8-30, is cited as disclosing peripheral task components.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. While column 6, lines 43-63, discloses “returning to the client system a preliminary confirmation of receipt of the client request without waiting for a timer expiry” and that “the confirmation of receipt includes a session identifier . . . assigned by a process at the server system,” there appears to be no disclosure of a “core task component,” which is defined in claims 1 and 17 as a task “that must be completed by the server before a decision is made on whether to honor the request” (underlining indicates language added in this

amendment). In particular, there is no disclosure of a task that must be completed before a decision is made to honor the request from the client, and it is not seen where Niblett et al. teaches that such a task must be completed by the server.

Niblett et al. discloses the use of session identifiers that are each associated with a request from a client system. When the server system of Niblett et al. receives a reply from an application program, which reply includes a session identifier, the server associates the reply with the request that corresponds with the session identifier and sends to the client system a reply that includes the session identifier. See column 7, lines 8-17. Session identifiers are used to distinguish between concurrent sessions, and the client system is enabled to interleave interactions with different applications because the client system has a way to distinguish between them. See column 7, lines 21-27.

While Niblett et al. appears to teach using session identifiers to facilitate concurring or parallel processing of applications, it is not seen where Niblett et al. discloses core task components “that must be completed by the server before a decision is made on whether to honor the request” or peripheral task components “that can be completed after a decision is made on whether to honor the request,” as recited in claims 1 and 17 as amended above. Accordingly, Niblett et al. fails to disclose at least the limitation “the server identifying a task corresponding to the request, the identified task including a set of core task components and a set of peripheral task components, the core task components including task components that must be completed by the server before a decision is made on whether to honor the request, the peripheral task components including task components that can be completed after a decision is made on whether to honor the request” and therefore fails to anticipate claims 1 and 17.

In addition, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the request context data comprises rights management data. This limitation is supported in the Specification at least at the Appendix, which discloses that additional information can be put into a message, including, for example, information relating to a request for licensing, publishing, certification, activation, enrollment, or subenrollment. Niblett et al. discloses only the use of session identifiers and does

not disclose the use of request context data that includes rights management data, such as but not limited to the particular types of information disclosed in the Appendix.

Further with regard to claim 17, claim 17 has been amended to recite that the request context data comprises authentication data. As disclosed in the Appendix portion of the Specification, this authentication data may include information as to whether a request is authenticated and/or an ID of an authenticated user. By contrast, while Niblett et al. discloses the use of session identifiers to differentiate between different requests, there is no teaching or suggestion that Niblett et al. discloses the collection of request context data that includes authentication data. Accordingly, Niblett et al. fails to disclose at least the limitation “the server collecting request context data relevant to the request and the identified task, the request context data comprising authentication data,” as recited in claim 17 as amended above and therefore fails to anticipate claim 17.

Claims 2-11 and 13 depend from claim 1 and are therefore also not anticipated by Niblett et al. at least by reason of their dependency from claim 1. Similarly, as claims 18-27 and 29 depend from claim 17, they are also not anticipated by Niblett et al. at least by reason of their dependency from claim 17.

It is to be noted that Applicants generally deny, and do not concede to, any statement, position or averment in the Office Action in support of the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102, which is not specifically addressed by the foregoing arguments and response. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The following obviousness rejections are asserted under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

- (i) Claims 12 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Niblett et al. in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0041147 (“Van Den Oord et al.”).
- (ii) Claims 14-16 and 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Niblett et al.

Without elaboration, since the obviousness rejections are primarily based on the teachings of Niblett et al. as applied to base claims 1 and 17, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 12, 14-16, 28, and 30-32 are patentable over the combination of Niblett et al., and Van Den Oord et al. at least by virtue of the above noted deficiencies of Niblett et al. with regard to claims 1 and 17.

It is to be noted that Applicants generally deny, and do not concede to, any statement, position or averment in the Office Action in support of the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103, which is not specifically addressed by the foregoing arguments and response. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants believe that the present remarks are responsive to each of the points raised in the Office Action, and respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and passage to issue of the application at the Examiner's earliest convenience is earnestly solicited.

Date: October 6, 2010

/Joseph F. Oriti/
Joseph F. Oriti
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439